REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the above-identified application, and were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 9, 13, and 16-18 were amended, and claim 19 was cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-18 are at issue in the above-identified application.

I.   35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection of Claims

Claims 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the invention Examiner believes that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's amendment to claims 16-18 obviates this rejection. Claim 19 has been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

II.   35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Donoho (U.S. Patent No. 6,801,929). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus for replying to an inquiry from customers. The apparatus includes means for storing a customer priority for each customer in a customer priority information table; means for assigning a reply priority to said inquiry according to said customer priority information table; means for determining whether a solution to said inquiry is stored; and means for replying to said inquiry based on said reply priority.

Donoho is directed to a relevance clause for computed relevance messaging. The advice reader obtain advisories from advice servers which operate at advice sites. (See column 3, lines 49-52.) The advice readers determine the relevance of the advisories to determine the relevance of the advisory to a consumer's computer. (See column 3, lines 53-57.) The advice

reader then notifies the user of relevant messages. (See column 3, lines 57-59.) The user may configure the advice reader for advisories (see column 75, lines 45-50). The advice reader in Donoho does not store a customer priority for each customer in a customer priority information table, as required by claim 1. Donoho further does not assign a reply priority to an inquiry according to the customer priority information table, as required by claim 1. Rather, the advice reader operates continually in an automatic mode, gathering and distributing advisories as they occur. (See column 4, lines 6-9.) Accordingly, claim 1 and claims 2-4 that depend from claim 1 are allowable over Donoho.

For reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claims 1-4, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5-18 are also allowable over Donoho. Claim 19 has been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

III.   35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan et al. (Pre-Grant Publication No. US 2004/0013253) in view of Doerr et al. (Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/0002546). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Hogan et al. is directed to a call processing rate quote system and method. The system includes a processor that receives call data, determines the type of call, determines the processing required, and determines whether operator assistance is required. (See Abstract.) Each call may be prioritized based on when the call was queued or based on call priority. (See paragraph 0376.) A client interface ("CLIF") is provided to facilitate communications among applications. (See Abstract.) The CLIF sends requests to an application and awaits a response in reply to the request. (See paragraph 1282.)

Hogan et al. does not store a customer priority for each customer in a customer priority information table, as required by claim 1. Hogan et al. further does not assign a reply priority to an inquiry according to the customer priority information table, as required by claim 1. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate storage of advice solutions as taught by Doerr et al. with the teachings of Hogan et al. to derive Claim 1. Because claim 1 includes limitations that are neither disclosed nor suggested by Hogan et al. or Doerr et al., claim 1, and claims 2-4 that depend from claim 1, are allowable over Hogan et al. in view of Doerr et al.

For reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claims 1-4, Applicant respectfully submits that 5-18 are also allowable over Donoho. Claim 19 has been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 9, 2006   By: _____

Marina N. Saito
Registration No. 42,121
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000